

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA

Jody E. Ratcliff,)
)
Plaintiff,)

v.)

1:17-cv-00174

American Honda Motor Co., Inc.;)
Auto Generator & Starter Service,)
Inc.; Avon Product, Inc.; Barnes)
Motor & Parts Co., Inc. (f/k/a/)
Barnes Motor Co.); BMW of North)
America, LLC; Bobbi Brown)
Professional Cosmetics, Inc.;)
Borg Warner Morse TEC, LLC;)
Brenntag Specialties, Inc. (f/k/a/)
Mineral and Pigment Solutions, Inc.)
and Whittaker, Clark & Daniels,)
Inc.); British American Tobacco, PLC)
(d/b/a Yardley and as successor to)
Yardley & Co. Ltd.); Britain's)
Garage, LLC; Clinique Laboratories,)
LLC; Colgate-Palmolive Co.;)
ConAgra Brands, Inc. (f/k/a ConAgra)
Foods, Inc., individually and as)
successor to Beatrice Foods Co.;)
Esmark, Inc. and International)
Playtex, Inc.); Continental)
Automotive Systems, Inc. (f/k/a)
Continental Teves, Inc.); Cyprus)
Amax Minerals Co.; Dan Wise)
Chevrolet, Inc.; Dana Companies LLC;)
Doug Henry Chevrolet Buick, GMS,)
Inc. (f/k/a Doug Henry Chevrolet)
Buick Pontiac GMC Truck, Inc. and)
Doug Henry Chevrolet Buick Pontiac)
GMC, Inc.); Doug Henry Chevrolet,)
Inc. (f/k/a Doug Henry Chevrolet)
Oldsmobile, Inc.); Edgewell Personal)
Care Co. (individually and as)
successor to Playtex Product, Inc.,)
f/k/a Playtex FP Group, Inc.,)
individually and as successor to)
Playtex Family Products Corp. and)

Playtex Holdings, Inc.); Edgewell)
 Personal Care LLC (f/k/a Energizer)
 Personal Care LLC, individually and)
 as successor to Playtex Products,)
 Inc. f/k/a Playtex FP Group, Inc.,)
 individually and as successor to)
 Playtex Family Products Corp. and)
 Playtex Holdings, Inc.); Estée Inc.;)
 Frema Motors Inc.; Ford Motor Co.;)
 Gene Taylor Inc. (f/k/a Gene Taylor)
 Chevrolet, Inc. and Gene Taylor)
 Chevrolet-GMC, Inc.); Genuine Parts)
 Co.; Hennessy Industries, Inc.;)
 Honeywell International, Inc. (f/k/a)
 Allied Signal, Inc., as successor to)
 the Bendix Corp.); Imerys Talc)
 America, Inc. (f/d/a Luzenac)
 America, Inc.); L'Oreal SA)
 (individually and as successor to)
 The Maybelline Co. and Maybelline,)
 Inc.); L'Oreal USA Creative, Inc.)
 (d/b/a Maybelline and f/k/a)
 Maybelline Cosmetics Corp.,)
 individually and as successor to The)
 Maybelline Co. and Maybelline,)
 Inc.); L'Oreal USA, Inc. (f/k/a)
 Cosmair, Inc.); Maremont Corp.;)
 Massey Motor Co.; Maybelline LLC;)
 Mitsubishi Motors North America,)
 Inc.; National Automotive Parts)
 Association, Inc.; Navistar, Inc.)
 (f/k/a International Truck and)
 Engine Corp.); Nissan North America,)
 Inc.; Paul Benton Motors of North)
 Carolina LLC (individually and as)
 successor to Gene Taylor, Inc.; Gene)
 Taylor Chevrolet, Inc. and Gene)
 Taylor Chevrolet-GMS, Inc.);)
 Personal Care Products Council)
 (f/k/a Cosmetics, Toiletries and)
 Fragrance Association); Playtex)
 Products LLC (individually and as)
 successor to Playtex Products, Inc.)
 f/k/a Playtex FP Group, Inc.,)
 individually and as successor to)
 Playtex Family Products Corp. and)
 Playtex Holdings, Inc.); R&S)

Automotive; R&S Automotive Service)
 LLC; Revlon, Inc.; Revlon Consumer)
 Products Corp.; Sale Auto Mall, Inc.)
 (f/k/a Sale Chevrolet, Buick, BMW,)
 Inc. and Sale Chevrolet-BMW, Inc.,)
 and as successor to Poole Buick Co.,)
 Inc.); Sale Automotive Group, Inc.;)
 Sale Ford LLC; Standard Motor)
 Products, Inc.; Tampbrands, Inc.;)
 Target Corp.; Tilghman's Garage LLC;)
 The Estée Lauder Companies, Inc.;)
 The Gillette Co.; The Proctor &)
 Gamble Co. (individually and as)
 successor to Yardley of London and)
 The Gillette Co.); Toyota Motor)
 Sales USA, Inc.; Walgreen Co.;)
 White Owl Parts Co., Inc.;)
 Whittaker, Clark & Daniels, Inc.;)
 Winner Chevrolet, Inc.; Wynn Odom)
 Ford, Inc.,)
)
 Defendants.)

ORDER

This matter is before the court on the Joint Motion of Plaintiff Jody E. Ratliff and Defendant Target Corporation to dismiss Defendant Target Corporation for the reasons stated in the Joint Motion (Doc. 161), and for cause shown;

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Joint Motion is GRANTED, and the claims of Plaintiff Jody E. Ratliff that were or could have been brought against Defendant Target Corporation are hereby DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE, with each party to bear her or its own costs. Target's Motion to Dismiss, or in the Alternative, Motion to Stay (Doc. 140), is DENIED AS MOOT.

/s/ Thomas D. Schroeder
United States District Judge

May 25, 2017